



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/819,109 | 03/27/2001 | Samir Gupta | 000282 | 4309 |

23696 7590 06/23/2004

Qualcomm Incorporated
Patents Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-1714

EXAMINER

GARY, ERIKA A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2681

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,109

Applicant(s)

GUPTA ET AL.

Examiner

Erika A. Gary

Art Unit

2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on April 19, 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's submission of prior art, Ding et al., US Patent Number 5,838,787 (hereinafter Ding) in view of McLaughlin, US Patent Number 5,526,426 (hereinafter McLaughlin).

Regarding claim 1, Ding discloses a device comprising: a communication module configured to communicate with a base station in a wireless communications system; an acoustic echo canceller configured to detect and cancel an acoustic echo generated during a communication between said device and said base station; a network echo suppressor receiving an input from said acoustic echo canceller and passing said communication to said acoustic echo canceller, said network echo suppressor attenuating a network echo generated during said communication between said device and said base station [fig. 2; col. 1: lines 7-10; col. 3: lines 25-55].

What Ding does not specifically disclose is computing a coherence estimate on a block of transmit signal samples and a block of receive signal samples, wherein each

block of samples comprises samples from a previous block and new samples.

However, McLaughlin teaches this limitation [col. 5: lines 37-41].

Ding and McLaughlin are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is, communication devices with echo cancellers and network echo suppressors. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ding to include McLaughlin. The motivation for this combination would have been to improve the sound quality of the device.

Regarding claim 3, Ding discloses said acoustic echo canceller operates in at least two distinct modes of operation [col. 1: lines 7-10].

Regarding claim 4, Ding discloses said modes of operation include a hands free mode [col. 1: lines 7-10].

Regarding claim 5, Ding discloses said modes of operation include a handset mode [col. 1: lines 7-10], as it is inherent that devices equipped with a hands free functionality also work in a handset mode.

Regarding claim 6, it is inherent that a hands free mode includes a headset mode.

Regarding claim 7, it is inherent that the acoustic echo canceller includes a muting parameter.

Regarding claim 9, it is inherent that the network echo suppressor includes processing logic – i.e. state machine)).

Regarding claim 10, Ding discloses the network echo suppressor includes a gain module [fig. 2].

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ding and McLaughlin in view of Umemoto, US Patent Number 5,416,829 (hereinafter Umemoto).

Regarding claim 2, Umemoto discloses a dual mode cellular radio communication device including an echo canceller wherein the device operates in both and analog (i.e. AMPS) and digital system (i.e. CDMA) [col. 1: lines 15-22; abstract].

Ding, McLaughlin, and Umemoto are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is, communication devices with echo cancellers. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ding and McLaughlin to include Umemoto to incorporate usage in a plurality of systems for greater diversity.

4. Claims 11-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's submission of prior art, Romesburg, US Patent Number 6,185,300 (hereinafter Romesburg) in view of Ding and McLaughlin.

Regarding claim 11, Romesburg discloses a method comprising steps of: coupling a plurality of acoustic echo canceller parameters from an acoustic echo canceller to a network echo suppressor; determining a voice activity parameter; computing a coherence estimate of a transmit signal sample and a receive signal sample to detect a network echo; providing said voice activity parameter and said coherence estimate to said network echo suppressor; attenuating said network echo with said network echo suppressor [col. 5: line 64 – col. 6: line 31].

What Romesburg does not specifically disclose is that the attenuated network echo is passed to said acoustic echo canceller. However, Ding teaches this limitation [fig. 2; col. 3: lines 25-55].

Romesburg also does not specifically disclose that the coherence estimate is computed on a block of samples, wherein each block of samples comprises samples from a previous block and new samples. However, McLaughlin teaches this limitation [col. 5: lines 37-41].

Romesburg, Ding, and McLaughlin are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is, communication devices with echo cancellers and network echo suppressors. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Romesburg to include Ding and McLaughlin. The motivation for this combination would have been to improve the sound quality of the device.

Regarding claim 12, Romesburg discloses the coupling step comprises setting said plurality of said acoustic echo canceller parameters, and said network echo suppressor reading said plurality of said acoustic echo canceller parameters [col. 6: lines 11-31].

Regarding claim 13, it is inherent that the determining step comprises using vocoder frame rate determination as this is known in the art for detecting voice activity.

Regarding claim 14, Romesburg discloses the computing step comprises computing a coherence estimate on a block of samples, wherein said block of samples comprises said transmit signal samples and said receive signal samples [col. 20: lines

37-40 (it is inherent that a block of samples is used to determine if an echo or double-talk is occurring)).

Regarding claim 15, it is known in the art for a block of samples to comprise 128 samples. Further, McLaughlin teaches that half of a block of samples are new [col. 5: lines 37-41].

Regarding claim 16, Romesburg discloses said providing step comprises setting said voice activity parameter and said coherence estimate and said network echo suppressor reading said voice activity parameter and said coherence estimate [col. 6: lines 11-31].

Regarding claim 17, Romesburg discloses said providing step comprises providing said voice activity parameter and said coherence estimate to a state machine [col. 6: lines 11-31 (it is inherent that the echo suppressor includes processing logic – i.e. state machine)].

Regarding claim 18, Romesburg discloses said attenuating step comprises executing a state machine [col. 6: lines 11-31 (it is inherent that the echo suppressor includes processing logic – i.e. state machine)].

Regarding claim 19, Romesburg discloses said attenuating step comprises setting a receive gain parameter [col. 18: lines 55-60].

Regarding claim 20, Romesburg discloses said attenuating step comprises using a gain module to attenuate a receive signal, said gain module attenuating said receive signal according to a value of a receive gain parameter [col. 18: lines 55-60].

Regarding claim 21, Romesburg discloses a method for communicating between a base station and a mobile station, said method comprising steps of: determining a voice activity parameter of said communication; computing a coherence estimate of a transmit signal sample of said communication and a receive signal sample of said communication to detect a network echo; ascertaining a plurality of acoustic echo canceller parameters from an acoustic echo canceller; providing said voice activity parameter, said coherence estimate, and said plurality of acoustic echo canceller parameters to a network echo suppressor; attenuating said network echo with said network echo suppressor [col. 5: line 64 – col. 6: line 31].

What Romesburg does not specifically disclose is that the attenuated network echo is passed to said acoustic echo canceller. However, Ding teaches this limitation [fig. 2; col. 3: lines 25-55].

Romesburg also does not specifically disclose that the coherence estimate is computed on a block of samples, wherein each block of samples comprises samples from a previous block and new samples. However, McLaughlin teaches this limitation [col. 5: lines 37-41].

Romesburg, Ding, and McLaughlin are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is, communication devices with echo cancellers and network echo suppressors. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Romesburg to include Ding and McLaughlin. The motivation for this combination would have been to improve the sound quality of the device.

Regarding claim 22, Romesburg teaches a dual mode cellular radio communication device including an echo canceller wherein the device operates in both and analog (i.e. AMPS) and digital system (i.e. CDMA) [col. 7: lines 3-5].

Regarding claim 23, it is inherent that the determining step comprises using vocoder frame rate determination as this is known in the art for detecting voice activity.

Regarding claim 24, Romesburg discloses said computing step comprises computing a coherence estimate on a block of samples, wherein said block of samples comprises said transmit signal samples and said receive signal samples [col. 20: lines 37-40 (it is inherent that a block of samples is used to determine if an echo or double-talk is occurring)].

Regarding claim 25, it is known in the art for a block of samples to comprise 128 samples. Further, McLaughlin teaches that half of a block of samples are new [col. 5: lines 37-41].

Regarding claim 26, Romesburg discloses said ascertaining step comprises setting said plurality of said acoustic echo canceller parameters, and said network echo suppressor reading said plurality of said acoustic echo canceller parameters [col. 6: lines 11-31].

Regarding claim 27, it is inherent that the plurality of said acoustic echo canceller parameters includes a muting parameter and a mode of operation parameter as the telephone can be muted or used in a hands free mode.

Regarding claim 28, Romesburg discloses said providing step comprises providing said voice activity parameter and said coherence estimate and said plurality of

acoustic echo canceller parameters to a state machine [col. 6: lines 11-31 (it is inherent that the echo suppressor includes processing logic – i.e. state machine)].

Regarding claim 29, Romesburg discloses said attenuating step comprises executing a state machine [col. 6: lines 11-31 (it is inherent that the echo suppressor includes processing logic – i.e. state machine)].

Regarding claim 30, Romesburg discloses said attenuating step comprises executing a state machine, said state machine setting a receive gain parameter, and using a gain module to attenuate a receive signal, and gain module attenuating said receive signal according to said receive gain parameter [col. 18: lines 55-60].

Allowable Subject Matter

5. The indicated allowability of claims 15 and 25 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to McLaughlin. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11, and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kok, US Patent Number 6,249,581, discloses an adaptive canceller of acoustic echoes wherein a block of samples comprises 128 samples.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erika A. Gary whose telephone number is 703-308-0123. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, supervisor Nay Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750 or to the 2600 Customer Service Office at 703-306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Erika Gary
Primary Examiner

EAG
June 21, 2004


ERIKA GARY
PATENT EXAMINER